

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 6 and 24-28 are currently at issue in the application. No claims have been amended, added, or canceled herein. Claims 29-37 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement previously issued by the USPTO.

1. Rejection of Claims 6 and 24-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 6 and 24-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,788,493 to Liptak (hereinafter "Liptak"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6

Independent claim 6 is directed to a source having an impedance and connected to a load. The source comprises: "a detection circuit to determine whether a current flow through the impedance is load-induced or source-induced; and a processing circuit to perform an operation based upon whether the current flow is load-induced or source-induced, *wherein the source is a measuring instrument* further comprising an output indicator which indicates whether the current flow is source-induced or load-induced." (emphasis added). It is submitted that Liptak does not disclose all of the elements of the claim.

Liptak is directed to a power flow direction detection apparatus that is connected to conductors that connect a load to a source, as described by Liptak in the abstract. This is further supported at col. 2, lines 18-20, where Liptak describes that the "invention provides an apparatus for measuring the direction of power flow *through conductors connecting a load to a source...*" (emphasis added). This is illustrated in Fig. 2, where the source (DC Source, 26) is connected to a load (Motor, 28). Measurement of the direction of power flow is accomplished, as described at col. 3,

lines 3-25, by connecting two wattmeters to conductors of a three-phase power line, with the output of the wattmeters connected to a sum and filter circuit. The sign of the sum and filter circuit depends upon the direction of flow of electric power in the conductors.

Thus, Liptak discloses monitoring power between a source and a load. This monitor is separate from and inserted between the source and load, serving to determine direction of power flow between the source and load. However, Liptak contains no disclosure of a source that includes "a detection circuit to determine whether a current flow through the impedance is load-induced or source-induced." Furthermore, the source of Liptak is not a measuring instrument, as claimed. The source, as consistently described in Liptak, is a power source, and Liptak at no point provides any disclosure of a source that is a measuring instrument.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Liptak cannot anticipate claim 6 because the reference does not teach all of the elements claimed. Thus it is submitted that claim 6 is allowable over Liptak, and the rejection of claim 6 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Dependent Claims

Claims 24-28 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 6, and it is submitted that these dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6. Furthermore, it is submitted that claims 24-28 also include further bases for patentability.

For example, claim 26 recites that "the source is an active harmonic filter that selectively opposes currents generated by local harmonic sources while not generating signals to oppose currents caused by harmonic voltage sources located elsewhere in a system." The Examiner asserts that Liptak teaches such a filter, and refers to elements 82, and 84A of Fig. 2. These elements, as described at col. 9, lines 8-15, describe a capacitor (82) and resistor (84A) and an amplifier 80, that serves as a filter portion of the sum and filter circuit (14). This sum and filter circuit (14), described at col. 3, lines 47-50, generates a logic signal in response to power flow. However, this portion of

Liptak does not disclose the claimed active harmonic filter that selectively opposes currents generated by local harmonic sources while not generating signals to oppose currents caused by harmonic voltage sources located elsewhere in the system. As discussed, Liptak discloses a monitor that is connected to conductors between a source and a load, and contains no disclosure of local harmonic sources, or of harmonic voltage sources located elsewhere in a system. Accordingly, Liptak cannot anticipate claim 26 for at least these further reasons.

Dependent claim 27 recites, for example, "a voltage source to generate an output voltage" and "a DC offset elimination circuit, which is a DC servo control loop connected to the voltage source, to eliminate DC offset voltages of the output voltage." The Examiner asserts that Liptak teaches such elements at elements 76, and 88 of Fig. 7, and also asserts that pulse voltage discloses the claimed voltage source. It is noted that elements 76 and 88 of Fig. 7 are comparators, as described at col. 7, lines 66-68, and col. 9, lines 1-3. It is submitted that this portion of Liptak does not teach the claimed voltage source and DC offset elimination circuit which is a DC servo control loop. In fact, the voltage source of Liptak is simply the power source that is separate from the monitoring circuit, and thus Liptak cannot have a DC servo control loop connected to the voltage source. Accordingly, Liptak cannot anticipate claim 27 for at least these further reasons.

The dependent claims may include further bases for patentability, and the Applicant reserves the right to assert any such further basis for patentability in the future. Thus it is submitted that the rejection of claims 24-28 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. Conclusion

In light of the above Remarks/Arguments, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & HART LLP


By:

Kenneth C. Winterton
Registration No. 48,040
(303) 473-2700, x2717

Date: May 23, 2007

3714319_1.DOC